

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the above application. By the above amendment, claims 8-10 have been added.

The Office Action dated October 5, 2005, has been received and carefully reviewed. In that Office Action, claims 1-4, 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yonekura. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yonekura in view of Pugel. It is believed that claims 1-7 and new claims 8-10 are allowable over the art of record, and reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-7 and examination and allowance of claims 8-10 is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yonekura. Claim 1 requires a mixer for mixing a received radio-frequency signal with a local signal to convert the radio-frequency signal into an intermediate-frequency signal or baseband signal, a local signal generator, a level switcher for switching an output signal level of the local signal generator, and a controller for controlling the level switcher according to a frequency of the received signal. Yonekura does not include a level switcher as claimed. Element 37, referred to in the Office Action as a level switcher, is a frequency multiplier. Element 37 can affect the frequency of a signal but there is no indication that element 37 affects a level of the signal as claimed. Claim 1 is submitted to be allowable over Yonekura for at least this reason.

In addition, claim 1 requires a controller for controlling a level switcher according to a frequency of a received signal. Even if element 37 of Yonekura is assumed, for sake of argument only, to be a "level switcher," element 37 is not controlled according to a frequency of a received signal as claimed. Instead, element 37 is controlled based on a level difference between a filtered signal and the intermediate frequency signal delivered to the intermediate frequency filter circuitry 27 (column 6, lines 25-35). This level difference is based on the presence of a noise component and not based on the frequency of the received signal. For this reason as well, claim 1 is submitted to be allowable over Yonekura.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and are submitted to be allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yonekura in view of Pugel. Claim 5 depends from claim 1. Claim 1 is submitted to be allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. Pugel does not address the shortcomings of Yonekura discussed above in connection with claim 1. Claim 5 is therefore submitted to be allowable over the references of record.

New claim 8 is also submitted to be allowable over the art of record. Claim 8 requires a method of controlling a radio-frequency receiver that includes the steps of receiving a radio-frequency signal, generating a local signal using a local signal generator, mixing the received radio-frequency signal with the local signal to convert the radio-frequency signal into an intermediate-frequency signal or baseband signal, and controlling an output signal level of the local signal generator based on a frequency of the received signal. Claim 8 is related to the device defined by claim 1 and is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 8 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 8. In addition, claim 10 further distinguishes over the art of record by requiring that the multiplier by which the voltage controlled oscillator signal is multiplied be held constant. Yonekura discloses a device that changes a frequency multiplier under certain circumstances. Claim 10 is submitted to further distinguish over the art of record for this reason.

CONCLUSION

Each issue raised in the Office Action dated October 5, 2005, has been addressed, and it is believed that claims 1-10 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-7 and examination and allowance of claims 8-10 is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Scott Wakeman (Reg. No. 37,750) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.


Application No. 09/941,558
Amendment dated January 5, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2005

Docket No.: 2936-0134P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.


Dated: January 5, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Charles Gorenstein

Registration No.: 29,271

Scott T. Wakeman 

Registration No.: 37,750

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorneys for Applicant